

---

## PLANNING COMMITTEE 26/9/16

---

**Present:** Councillor Anne Lloyd Jones - Chair  
Councillor Elwyn Edwards - Vice-chair

**Councillors:** Gwen Griffith, Sian Wyn Hughes (substitute), Eric M. Jones, June Marshall, Michael Sol Owen, W. Roy Owen (substitute), W. Tudor Owen, Eirwyn Williams, Gruffydd Williams, Hefin Williams, John Wyn Williams and Owain Williams (substitute).

**Others invited:** Councillors Lesley Day, Trevor Edwards, John Wynn Jones, Angela Russell, Gethin Glyn Williams (Local members).

**Also in attendance:** Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Service Manager), Cara Owen (Development Control Manager), A. Rhys Roberts (Development Control Officer), Dafydd Gareth Jones (Senior Planning Officer - Minerals and Waste - for Item 5.3 on the agenda), Gareth Roberts (Senior Transport Development Control Officer), Rhun ap Gareth (Senior Solicitor) and Bethan Adams (Member Support Officer).

**Apologies:** Councillor Endaf Cooke, Simon Glyn, Dyfrig Wynn Jones, and John Pughe Roberts.

### 1. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillors Sian Wyn Hughes and W. Roy Owen who were attending the meeting of this Committee for the first time were welcomed.

Members were reminded to confirm whether they would be attending site visits in order to ensure that suitable transport arrangements were made.

### 2. DECLARATION OF PERSONAL INTEREST

(a) The following members declared a personal interest for the reasons noted:

- Councillor Gwen Griffith, in item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C15/1081/11/LL) as she was member of the Traeth Lafan Local Nature Reserve Management Committee; and in item 5.10 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/0901/16/LL) as she was the applicant.
- Councillor June Marshall in item 5.3 on the agenda, (planning application number C15/0181/11/LL) as she knew some of the objectors;
- Councillor Gethin Glyn Williams, in item 5.8 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/0848/00/LL) as he was a member of Ysgol y Traeth's governing body.

Members were of the opinion that they were prejudicial interests and they left the Chamber during the discussion on the applications noted above.

(b) The following members declared that they were local members in relation to the items noted:

- Councillor Lesley Day, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.3 on the agenda (planning application number C15/1081/11/LL);
- Councillor Angela Russell, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.4 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/0537/38/LL);
- Councillor Sian Wyn Hughes, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.5 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0590/42/AM);

- Councillor June Marshall, (a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5 on the agenda (planning application C16/0669/11/LL);
- Councillor John Wyn Jones, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in relation to item 5.7 on the agenda (planning application number C16/0781/11/LL);
- Councillor Gethin Glyn Williams, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.8 on the programme, (planning application number C16/0848/00/LL);
- Councillor Trevor Edwards, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.9 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/0886/15/LL);
- Councillors John Wyn Williams and R. Hefin Williams, (not a member of this Planning Committee), in item 5.9 on the agenda, (planning application number C16/0886/15/LL).

The members withdrew to the other side of the Chamber during the discussions on the applications in question and did not vote on these matters.

### 3. MINUTES

The Chair signed the minutes of the previous meeting of this committee, held on 4 April 2016, as a true record.

### 4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee considered the following applications for development.

Details of the applications were expanded upon and questions were answered in relation to the plans and aspects of the policies.

#### RESOLVED

#### 1. Application number C14/0832/11/LL – Castle Hill Arcade, 196, High Street Bangor

Change of use of part of the existing shop, installing a new shop front and construction of a two-storey extension on top of the existing rear extension to create two shops and accommodation for 64 students.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located on the High Street within Bangor City centre and close to the cathedral. It was noted that the building was grade II registered and was also located within the Bangor Conservation Area.

It was explained that even though the proposed extension was to the rear of the site and was relatively concealed from nearby public spaces, this did not justify an extension of this scale, bulk, form and design as it was considered that it would have a substantial impact on the appearance and character of the listed building. It was noted that the Bangor Conservation Area was vast and included several grade I listed buildings and the topography of Bangor meant that parts of the city were visible from a distance, e.g. views from the main University building (which is a grade I listed building) across the city. It was considered that the flat-roof aspect would appear as an incongruous feature from views across the city and was neither respectful of the listed building located in front of it, nor of the street development patterns of the surrounding area.

It was noted that objections had been received based on overlooking from windows and gardens. It was noted that the proposal was considered to be contrary to policy B23 of the Gwynedd Unitary Development Plan (GUDP) as the development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of nearby units and houses and that the development would not ensure a sufficient standard of living for the occupants of the development.

- (b) It was proposed and seconded to refuse the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted:

- In relation to language assessment of applications, it is the cumulative effect rather than the individual application that should be assessed.
- Would it be possible to receive information about the numbers of student units allowed last year and for the two year period?
- That the recommendation to refuse was strong, the proposed extension would dominate the listed building and would ruin the views in the City;
- That the site needed to be developed but the rear extension would have a detrimental impact on the listed building;
- Concern with imposing a condition that prevented students from bringing a vehicle within three miles of the development and requesting that a transport plan be put in place before the development was occupied, rather than providing parking spaces for the development as it would not be possible to police it.

- (c) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:-

- As noted in the report, this proposal would not result in any change to the City's population as a student population already existed and it was considered unlikely to have a significant impact on the Welsh Language;
- That information regarding the number of student units and an assessment of the details were included in the report in paragraphs 5.5 to 5.16;
- That, with regard to imposing a condition preventing students from bringing a vehicle to within three miles of the development and requiring that a transport plan be put in place before the development was occupied, such conditions have already been imposed on consents in Wales and England with the inspector also imposing such conditions;
- That the reasons for refusing were robust.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application.**

**Reasons:**

- 1. The proposal, due to its scale, bulk, form and design would have a significant detrimental impact on the appearance and setting of the Grade II listed building and the Conservation Area and, therefore, it is contrary to policies B2, B3, B4, B22 and B24 of the GUDP and the requirements of the Welsh Office Circular 61/69.**
- 2. The proposal is considered contrary to policy B23 as the development would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenities of nearby units and houses due to its scale, bulk, form and design by having a dominant impact, causing overlooking and loss of privacy and that the development would not ensure a sufficient living standard for the occupiers of the development.**

- 2. Application number C14/0831/11/CR - Castle Hill Arcade, 196, High Street, Bangor**

Change of use of part of the existing shop, installing a new shop front and construction of a two-storey extension on top of the existing rear extension to create two shops and accommodation for 64 students.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that it was a listed building application and that it was conservation issues that would

be assessed, meaning the impact on the appearance and historic and architectural character of the listed building.

It was noted that the proposal in its existing form, due to its scale, bulk, form and design meant that it would dominate the listed building and have a substantial detrimental impact on its historic character.

**RESOLVED to refuse the application.**

**Reason:**

**The proposal due to its size, bulk, form and design would have a significant detrimental impact on the appearance and setting of the Grade II listed building and, therefore, it is contrary to policies B2, B3 and B4 of the GUDP and the requirements of the Welsh Office Circular 61/69.**

**3. Application number C15/1081/11/LL - Former Dickies Boat Yard, Beach Road, Bangor**

Re-submission of a previous application to import inert material in order to raise existing ground levels.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 4 July, 2016 in order to undertake a site visit. It was noted that Natural Resources Wales (NRW) and the Council's Public Protection Service had been re-consulted on the Construction Environment Management Plan and the scheduled mitigating environmental factors submitted to support the application. NRW and the Council's Public Protection Service were satisfied with that which was submitted.

It was emphasised that the application had been submitted for undertaking engineering work and raise the level of the land in order to provide a site for further development.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations that had been received. It was reported that a late objection had been received today by Friends of the Earth. It was noted that the issues raised had been assessed in the report.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) noted the following main points:-
- That part of the application was retrospective as the land levels had already been raised;
  - That there were no record of the materials used on the site so its structure could not be confirmed;
  - That the land surveys had been superficial;
  - That the site was open to erosion and that she was concerned about the stability of the land;
  - That the design of the sea-wall was insufficient and that it would not protect the site from the sea;
  - That there had been cases where the Local Authority had been successfully prosecuted when things had gone awry on unstable and contaminated land where planning permission had been granted;
  - That sufficient geo-environmental assessments could ensure the safety of the site;
  - That the proposal was contrary to policies B28 and B30 of the GUDP and to the Welsh Government's Technical Advice Note 15;

- That the land was contaminated albeit not listed on the contaminated land register and if houses were developed on the site in future, it would pose a substantial risk to human health;
- That there was risk that the contaminated material could seep into the Menai Strait. Are the recommended conditions sufficient to ensure that pollution would not escape from the site?

(c) In response to the observations of the local member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted:-

- That any application for development in the future would be decided on its own merits and that the proposal was to provide a site for development;
- That the land had been allocated in the GUDP as a redevelopment site;
- Confirmation had been received that neither NRW nor the Public Protection Service had objected the application;
- There was no evidence to justify refusing based on pollution;
- That the detailed technical reports submitted as part of the application had been assessed by specialists.

(ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted:

- That the report was comprehensive;
- That there was a preconception that applications should be allowed if the conditions imposed made the development an acceptable one;
- There was no firm evidence to justify refusing the application;
- That Bangor City Council was concerned about the visual impact of the development on the city and its residential areas;
- Last time, a member supported deferring the application and after receiving specialist opinion and by imposing the recommended conditions, the proposal was deemed acceptable;
- Time will tell whether problems arise with the site and consideration will be given to the situation when an application is submitted for redevelopment;
- That the local member had made valid points. Would the company be liable if problems arose?
- Could Gwynedd Council be held responsible if problems were to arise?
- The development would improve the site.

(d) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:-

- It would not be easy to justify refusing the application based on the visual impact considering the condition of the site at present;
- The landowner would be responsible if problems were to arise;
- Should the application be approved, the developers would have to obtain a marine licence from NRW before they could commence the development and this is a highly detailed and thorough process;
- There was no evidence of land instability;
- Internal and statutory experts gave their opinion which noted that the proposal with conditions was acceptable. It was explained that as the Council was following expert advice, should the application be allowed, the Council's legal position would be robust.

**RESOLVED to delegate powers to the Senior Planning, Environment and Public Protection Service Manager to approve the application, subject to the following scope of conditions and where indicated, the submission of specific information in**

**accordance with the requirements of conditions prior to the commencement of the development;**

- Temporary operations involving the full implementation of the scheme and import of 19,000 tonnes of material to be implemented within a nine-month time-scale of the date of notification to the Local Planning Authority,
- Permitted Operations & Compliance with the Submitted Details/Plans,
- Import of materials restricted to 500 tonnes per day, between the hours of 08.00 – 17.00 Mon to Fri & 08.00 – 13.00 on a Saturday, or 25 loads per day,
- Restoration to commence within 3 years of the completion of land raise operations unless a further planning permission is granted,
- Mitigation measures to reduce the impact on redshank, rock pipit and other features of local biodiversity interest, including;
- Prohibiting construction/dumping work one hour before and one hour after high tide, i.e. a no work period of 3 hours encompassing high tide,
- To avoid damage to nesting birds (rock pipits) no construction/dumping on the coastal slopes between (1st March and 1st August),
- Biodiversity enhancement to be incorporated into the development including features for waders & rock pipits,
- Monitoring surveys should be undertaken during the construction period to check that birds are continuing to use the site and that measures to minimise disturbance are being implemented successfully,
- Development to include provision for biodiversity enhancement,
- Removal of civil engineering equipment, structures & surplus plant machinery upon completion of the development,
- Control dust released and provide wheel cleaning equipment on site as a planning condition,
- Use restricted to the disposal of inert materials,
- Condition to specify the detailed design of the rip-rap material to specify the minimum and maximum size of stone to be used and any future maintenance requirements,
- Pollution control measures, site monitoring and ecological mitigation to be implemented in accordance with the Construction Environment Management Plan,
- Applicant to implement a scheme of water sampling and analysis to ascertain the presence of pollutants,
- Fuels or lubricants to be stored in a location to be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Bunding to be at least 110% of the fuel tank capacity.
- Note to applicant referring to the consultation response of Natural Resources Wales and Gwynedd Council Flood Risk Management and Coastal Erosion service,
- Note to applicant that the responsibility and subsequent liability for safe development and secure occupancy of the site rests with the developer and/or landowner,
- Note to applicant that the application has been assessed in accordance with the seven sustainability goals of the Well-being of Future Generations Act (Wales) 2015.

**4. Application number C16/0537/38/LL - Bryniau Caravan Park, Lôn Pin, Llanbedrog**

A retrospective application to retain a caravan site for 10 touring caravans, retain ancillary services and store caravans over winter.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer expanded on the background to the application and noted that the site was located in the countryside, within a Landscape Conservation Area and a Landscape of Outstanding Historic Interest.

It was reported that the Transportation Unit had no objections to the proposal as long as a condition was imposed to ensure that there was sufficient visibility to the entrance.

It was noted that the site in its current form was fairly hidden with a landscape plan in place to reinforce the screening. It was not considered, therefore, that the proposal would cause significant long term harm to the visual quality of the landscape.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) supported the application and noted that the site was hidden and that she was pleased to support a young local family and enable them to live in Pen Llŷn.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

A member noted that there were high hedgerows on the site and the site could hardly be seen from other places. A member drew attention to the fact that the Community Council was supportive of the application.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. In accordance with submitted plans;
2. The number of units on the site at any one time to be restricted to 10 and at the pitches shown on the plan submitted;
3. Conditions on the timeframe for siting caravans / holiday period / moving the caravans when not in use;
4. Storing on the land to the right of the site outlined on the submitted plan in yellow and between 1 November of one year and 28 February the following year;
5. Records list;
6. Landscaping within three months of the date of this permission;
7. Work to improve the entrance to be completed in accordance with the plan submitted and within three months of the date of the permission to be maintained in this way thereafter.
8. Reducing the height of the 'clawdd' to the north of the site, capping it permanently.

Notes:

1. It is suggested that alleviating measures be taken to protect and promote the Welsh language, such as a Welsh name for the site/ Welsh and/or bilingual signage and opportunities to provide information about the history and culture of the area. It is suggested that the Site Manager contact the Local Language Initiative (Hunaniaith) to have a discussion regarding other measures which could add value to the business.
2. A caravan site licence is required.

**5. Application number C16/0590/42/AM - Land near 10 Penrhos, Morfa Nefyn**

Construction of a dwelling and creation of parking spaces.

- (a) The Senior Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, noting that the application had been deferred at the Committee meeting held on 5 September 2016 in order to assess the amended details and responses to the re-consultation. Members of the Committee had visited the site prior to the meeting.

It was reported that this was an outline application to erect a residential dwelling on a plot of land that forms part of the garden of 10 Penrhos, Morfa Nefyn. As this was an outline

application, the only matter that required consideration was the principle of developing the site.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the Transportation Unit had no objection to the proposal if appropriate conditions were imposed to ensure that the hedge / wall to the north of the entrance was lowered and maintained at a height no greater than 1 metre in order to safeguard the necessary visibility splay of the entrance.

It was noted that in dealing with the application, it became apparent that some issues arose in terms of the ownership of the private track which leads from the county road to the site. It was emphasised that land ownership issues associated with the track were civil matters to be resolved between the applicant and the alternative landowner.

Due to the residential nature of the area, the development was not considered to be out of character or detrimental to the area's visual or residential amenities.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and the following main points were made:-
- The proposal would mean losing greenery in the area impacting biodiversity and the privacy of nearby houses;
  - Questioning whether there was a need for a house considering that there were approximately 30 houses for sale in the village;
  - It would not be an affordable house;
  - Concern about the effect on the community and Welsh language as the existing housing stock was not affordable;
  - That a number of houses in the village were holiday homes and empty at times;
  - Concern regarding access to the site and road safety in an area where accidents occurred;
  - That the proposal was an over-development that would not blend in with its location.
- (c) In response to the observations by the local member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that it was an application for a house within the development boundary that was before the Committee.
- (ch) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted:

- Concern about visibility where the track meets the road. Should a request to widen be made to improve the situation?
- Considering the size of the house, would it abut the boundary on both sides?
- Concern that it would set a precedent in the area if a house was allowed to be built in the garden;
- That the Town Council objected to the application and that there were no passing places on the private track;
- The hedge was not owned by the applicant;
- That there were modern houses adjacent to the site;
- There were no planning reasons for objecting the application so an appeal could not be defended.

- (d) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:-



- That the visibility to one side of the entrance was substandard but, as the applicant had agreed to cut the hedge down to a height of 1 metre in front of the site, it was acceptable;
- A widening was not necessary as the width of the road was sufficient and the entrance was a private one with two sufficient openings;
- In the application the maximum and minimum heights of the house were noted. Reference was made to the fact that the indicated size of the property would be similar to the expected size of a two storey, three bedroom affordable house;
- That Building Control usually requested a metre on either side of the site boundary and, from looking at the plans, there were more than two metres on either side;
- That the land on which the house was proposed to be built was in addition to the garden next to the existing house;
- Were full planning permission granted in future, a condition would be imposed stating that the height of the hedge be reduced before developing the site. The civil matter of ownership was an issue for the applicant to solve.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. The commencement of the development and submitting reserved matters
2. Materials and finishes.
3. Access and parking.
4. Landscaping.
5. Welsh Water - surface water.
6. Development to comply with the approved plans.

**6. Application number C16/0669/11/LL - 17, College Road, Bangor**

Change of use of existing seven bedroom house to a seven bedroom house in multiple occupation.

- (a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located within the development boundary of the city of Bangor and within a residential area known for its high percentage of student accommodation.

It was noted that it was not considered that approving one additional multiple occupation unit in an area where the majority of houses were already multiple occupancy houses would have a further significant detrimental impact on the social character of the local area.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (a member of this Planning Committee) made the following main points:-
- There was an over-provision of houses in multiple occupation on College Road with 90% as multiple occupancy;
  - The Gwynedd and Anglesey Joint Local Development Plan, subject to an ongoing Public Inquiry, recommended restricting the number of houses in multiple occupation within an area to 25% and those numbers should be restricted now;
  - There were already parking problems in the area;
  - That there would be more noise and disturbance for residents if the application were approved;
  - The proposal was contrary to policy CH14 of the GUDP as the development would have a negative impact on the social and environmental character of the area.
- (c) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted:

- Though in agreement with the observations of the local member, there were no valid planning reasons for refusing the application;
- That Bangor was turning into a city for students only with houses for local people disappearing;
- That the number of students was in decline;
- Would it be possible to receive clarification on the statistics noted in the report and the statistics noted by the local member?
- Concern about the cumulative effect of such developments on the area;
- When would it be possible to give consideration to that which is noted in the Joint Local Development Plan?
- That the area was not a place for families.

(ch) In response to the above observations, the officers noted:-

- There was already a cumulative effect of houses in multiple occupancy in the area and such applications were allowed thus keeping these areas residential;
- That the statistics associated with houses in multiple occupation in the report referred to the ward whilst the local member was providing figures related to this specific street;
- Evidence gathered was used in creating the Joint Local Development Plan now but, as the plan was the subject of an ongoing inspection, it would be premature to consider the policies. The situation would be reassessed in terms of the weight that could be placed on the policy following the inspection.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. 5 years
2. In accordance with the plans

**7. Application number C16/0781/11/LL - Former Railway Club (Railway Institute), Euston Road, Bangor**

Change condition number 2 (in accordance with the approved plans) of planning permission number APP/Q6810/A/16/314218 to modify the internal layout of the second floor to provide 8 one bedroom units and 2 four bedroom units instead of 8 one bedroom units.

- (a) The Development Control Manager expanded upon the background to the application noting that it was an application to amend condition number 2 of a previous planning permission in order to provide two additional units within the development (namely, a total of 29 units instead of the 27 that were previously approved). It was noted that the plan did not entail any changes to the external appearance of the building nor the setting of windows from what had already been approved on appeal.

It was noted that the previous application had been approved on appeal and that the planning inspector was of the opinion that the number of units was fairly moderate and would not be an over-development of the site or be likely to lead to any substantial damage to the amenities of existing residents in terms of noise or disturbance because of the layout and design of the building, control of the use and the presence of businesses in the adjacent neighbourhood.

In addition, it was emphasised that there had been no change to the policy position since the previous plan was approved and, therefore, the principle continued to be acceptable as

the use had already been approved and that this proposal was a minor amendment to that planning permission. The need could not, therefore, be questioned.

It was noted that significant consideration and weight had to be given to the clear lead given at the recent appeal decision. The development complied with the GUDP and national policies for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) Taking advantage of the right to speak, the applicant's agent noted the following main points:-
- The only thing in question was the internal layout;
  - Layout was changed as there was no demand for the types of units designed;
  - That the proposal would provide quality self contained units for students;
  - The inspector had noted in deciding the appeal that: "Contrary to the Council's opinion, I consider that the number of units being proposed is fairly moderate."
- (c) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee) objected to the application and he made the following main points:
- That he had not been aware of the appeal until after the decision;
  - His disappointment that allowing the application was being considered as there was no demand for this kind of provision;
  - That the flats would be empty as the size of the rooms would be too small;
  - That he was angry that a historic building had been lost.
- (ch) In response to the observations by the local member, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted :-
- That he had discussed the issue of receiving notice of the appeal with the local member and it had become clear that there had been technical problems with the member's i-Pad resulting in the member not receiving the notice;
  - That he understood the concerns and the disappointment of losing a building but in light of the recent appeal decision, as it was an application for two additional units only, it would be difficult to attest a refusal.
- (d) It was proposed to refuse the application as it was an over development. The proposal was seconded.

The Senior Planning Service Manager noted that the committee had refused the original application as it was an over-development and if this application was refused on the same basis, it would risk incurring costs against the Council at appeal, especially considering that there would be no physical changes made to the building. It was noted that the proposer and seconder would be expected to represent the Council on appeal.

In response to the observation by the proposer that two additional units meant that the proposal was not the same, the Senior Solicitor noted that the fact that the proposal was not the same did not mean that it was an over-development, and that the impact of both additional units was unacceptable from a planning point of view would have to be attested.

The proposer withdrew his proposal.

The seconder noted his desire to refuse the application due to excess of student accommodation, that the site of the application was in a residential area for families and that there were parking problems on Euston Road. In response, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that, if the application was refused on these grounds, the appeal would be lost with costs incurred by the Council, so he would have no choice but to refer the application to a cooling-off period.

(dd) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

In response to an observation from a member in terms of an end goal for student accommodation applications, the Senior Planning Service Manager noted that it was necessary to deal with the application before them. He added that, once the Joint Local Development Plan had been adopted, the policies would provide more detail and would help the Committee in determining applications.

During the ensuing discussion, the following main observations were noted:

- That it was difficult to find reasons to justify refusing the application considering that the original had been approved on appeal;
- Sympathy with the local member and that a trend was emerging where developers were receiving approval for student accommodation and were selling the sites for profit rather than developing them;
- That the site was too far from the University and in an area for families, setting a precedent;
- Sadness at the loss of a historic building.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Comply with the plans.
3. Comply with the conditions imposed on the permission granted on appeal APP/Q6810/A/16/314218 (slate, materials, Welsh Water / land drainage issues, landscaping).

**8. Application number C16/0848/00/LL - Barmouth Toilets, Marine Parade, Barmouth**

Application to convert unused public conveniences into a dwelling house, to include raising the height of the existing roof and external alterations.

(a) The Development Control Officer elaborated on the background of the application, and noted that the site was located in the centre of the coastal town of Barmouth and that Ysgol y Traeth was located to the east of the site and the playing field lay to the rear and northern boundary of the application site.

It was reported that a number of objections from the public had been received including considerations such as the proximity of the building to the school playing field, lack of amenity land surrounding the building, the building unsuitable for conversion and that the standard of the design was unacceptable. There was correspondence also which welcomed the development as an improvement to the current untidy condition of the site.

It was emphasised that this was an application to convert an existing building into a dwelling within the development boundary of a local centre as defined by the GUDP. It was noted that restoring and reusing the building would present an opportunity to tidy it and prevent its further deterioration, thus, safeguarding and improving the quality and condition of the site and protect the general amenities of the area.

Attention was drawn to the additional observations received by the applicant in response to objections, with a number of the observations referring to a legal covenant on the building but these were not material planning considerations.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) The local member (who was not a member of this committee) began by addressing the Committee. The local member was advised by the Senior Solicitor that he should declare personal interest and leave the chamber as he was a Governor of Ysgol y Traeth.

The local member declared that it was a prejudicial interest and he withdrew from the chamber.

- (c) It was proposed that the application be deferred to enable another member to operate as local member. The proposal was seconded.

**RESOLVED to defer the application.**

**9. Application number C16/0886/15/LL - Glyn Rhonwy Pumped Storage, Glyn Rhonwy, Llanberis**

An application to install an underground 132KV grid connection between the Glyn Rhonwy pumped storage site and Pentir substation.

- (a) The Development Control Manager elaborated on the background of the application and noted that the principle of creating a pumped storage facility at Glyn Rhonwy had already been accepted and approved by the Council.

It was believed that the principle was acceptable and that this element was a necessary step to ensure that a connection existed between the site where the electricity was generated and the site which distributed it. It was noted, for information, that an application was being considered for a Development Consent Order for a 99.9MW pumped storage scheme in Glyn Rhonwy. It was explained that an application of this size was considered to be a Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project, therefore, the final decision would be made by the Secretary of State.

It was noted that it was recommended to impose an additional condition to what was stated in the report, to agree on a way to cross the river before commencement of any development.

- (b) The local member (not a member of this Planning Committee), supported the application. A request was made for an explanation of the status of the original application for a pump storage should the application that was currently being considered by the Secretary of State be refused. In response, the Development Control manager noted that the original application would still be live.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time
2. Comply with plans
3. Need to submit and agree on a construction environmental management plan
4. Natural Resources Wales conditions
5. Highways notes
6. Party Wall Act Note
7. Agree on a mode of crossing the river before any development commences

**10. Application number C16/0910/16/LL - 19 Llwybrmain, Mynydd Llandygai, Bangor**

To erect a single-storey rear extension

- (a) The Development Control Officer expanded upon the background to the application noting that, due to its size and location, an extension of this type would not usually require planning permission, however, due to its location in the Mynydd Llandegai Conservation Area permission would be necessary for the change of material from a natural slate roof to a metal roof.

It was explained that, due to the location of the extension, the roof pitch of the extension would face away from any public viewpoints and therefore it was not considered that there would be any visual harm to the property. It was confirmed that there was no overlooking from the site and there would be no impact on the amenities of neighbours.

Attention was drawn to the fact that correspondence had been received from Llandegai Community Council stating its support of the application.

The development complied with the GUDP for the reasons noted in the report.

- (b) It was proposed and seconded to approve the application.

A member noted that he was dissatisfied that slate would not be used on the roof considering that the property was in a conservation area and that this would set a precedent. A member asked whether it would be possible to impose a condition that the colour of the roof be in keeping with the colour of slate. In response, the Development Control manager noted that it would be possible to impose a condition to this end.

**RESOLVED to approve the application.**

Conditions:

1. Time - five years,
2. The wall materials should be in keeping with the house.
3. Development to conform with the approved plans
4. Colour of the roof to be in keeping with the colour of slate

The meeting commenced at 1.00pm and concluded at 3.55pm.

---

**CHAIR**